plemented by Government along with detailed reasons of each;

(b) whether it is a fact that the prices fixed by Government have not been implemented by the drug companies and overcharged the consumer;

(c) whether it is a fact that the importer of drugs never got the prices of bulk drugs [1] before sale and sold at exorbitant prices;

(d) whether it is a fact that the formulators made, huge unintended profits which have not been recovered;

(e) whether it is also a tact that due to non-implementation of important provisions the benefit of pricing policy did not reach the public; and

(f) what steps Government propose to take to implement these provisions and by when these provisions will be implemented?

. THE MINIS] IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEV1ICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) Provisions of Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1979 have been implemented by the Government to the extent possible.

(b) Several instances of marketing for mulations at prices higher tha$_n$ the Govern^ ment fixed prices on the basis of wronjj categorisation, decisions of the Courts and representations against the prices fixed by the Government have come to the notice of the Government. Action in these cases is on in accordance with the due procedure of law.

(c) Sale prices of seven.! imported bulk drugs were fixed.

(d) Several instances of the formuiators enjoying the difference between the price of a bulk drug allowed i$_n$ the formulations and the actual import/procurement price hav$_e$ come to the notice of the Government and $_a$ctionjn all these cases to recover the amount in accordance with the due procedure of law is on.

(e) and (f) No, Sir. Implementation of the Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1979 has helped to moderate the drug prices. However, in actual implementation of DPCO 1979 $_a$ number of legal and administrative problems are being encountered. Government have therefore taken up a review of the 1978 Drug Policy.

Omission of Telephone Is umbers of M.Ps i„ Hyderabad Telephone Directory

2176. SHRI PUTTAPAGA RADHAKRISHANA; Will the Minister of COM MUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in the Hyderabad Telephone Directory published in December, 1984 under th$_e$ caption 'Mcm-bers of Parliament' only the list of Members of Parliament wa$_s$ published ami their telephone numbers were not mentioned therein though they were having telephones at the time of publication °f [lie] Telephone Directory; and

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER Q F THE MINISTRY OF IUNICATIONS (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA j: (a) No, Sir, it is not entirely correct. Telephone numbers *ot* 15 Members of • Parliament wer$_e$ published in the 1984 issue of Hyderabad Telephone Directory.

(b) The results of December, 1984 elecctions were available in the [las]t days of the month. Efforts were made to obtai$_n$ the telephone nun Members $_0$f f^{r} ment but it is regretted that full information could not be obtained by the time of printing of the directory. Full information would be given in the next issue of the directory.

Nominft/lon on the Board of management of M|s. Smith Stanistrect Pharmaceutical Limited

2177. DR. SHANTI G. PATEL:
DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI:

Will the Minister $_0$f INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Questio$_n$ 291 given in the Rajya Sabha on 18th. March, 1985 regarding the Workers' participation jn chemical and pharmaceutical unlertakings and state:

(a) whether the Federation of Smith Stanistreet Workers' Union has written to rum,'